

his back in his eagerness to accomplish the task. It was impossible to witness the actions of this animal without being struck by the amount of skill and intelligence exhibited. When the space cut through towards the centre was too narrow to admit its head, its teeth were applied above and below so as to increase the width from the outside towards the centre, until the remaining parts above and below formed two cones, the apices of which joined in the middle. Again and again the animal left off gnawing, and, standing upright on its hind legs, rested its front feet on the upper part of the tree, as if to feel whether it was on the move. This showed clearly that the creature knew exactly what it was about.

MISCELLANEOUS.

'The Land and Freshwater Mollusks of the British Isles.'

To the Editors of the *Annals and Magazine of Natural History.*

GENTLEMEN,—While thanking you for your notice of my little book, *'The Land and Freshwater Mollusks of the British Isles,'* I beg permission to offer a word of comment on some remarks therein made on some changes in nomenclature. Your reviewer says:—

“*Planorbis imbricatus* is changed to *Planorbis crista*, on the authority of the following synonymy:—

“*Nautilus crista*, Linnæus (1758), *Syst. Nat.* 10th edit. p. 709.

“*Turbo nautilus*, Linnæus (1767), *Syst. Nat.* 12th edit. p. 1241.

“And the author remarks,—‘It may be observed, on reference to the synonymy, that Linnæus made two species of this.’ But Linnæus did not make two species out of *Planorbis nautilus*. The facts are that he described *Nautilus crista* in the tenth edition of the ‘*Systema Naturæ* ;’ and in the twelfth edition changed the name of the species to *Turbo nautilus*, and referred to his *Nautilus crista* of the tenth edition as a synonym. We can only account for Mr. Reeve’s mistake by supposing that he has never consulted the twelfth edition—a supposition which is confirmed by the fact that throughout his volume the tenth edition is almost invariably referred to.”

As this declaration of opinion involves a principle in nomenclature to which I cannot agree, I beg leave to state that I purposely referred throughout my volume to the tenth edition of the ‘*Systema Naturæ*’ for the authority of the Linnæan species, after the example of M. Moquin-Tandon, because it is the first edition in which the species are established by the definition of specific names and characters. I followed also Moquin-Tandon in adopting the name of *crista* given to this *Planorbis* in the tenth edition of the ‘*Systema Naturæ*,’ because I agree with the learned author of the ‘*Mollusques Terrestres et Fluviales de France*’ in thinking that Linnæus was not justified in changing it, in his twelfth edition, to *nautilus*. An author is no more justified in changing his own established name of a species than any other writer would be.

With reference to your reviewer’s observations on my remark that

Linnæus made two species of this *Planorbis*, it is clear, from the opening lines of the paragraph, that the sense intended to be conveyed is not that which he has presented. They are as follows:—

“The minute, semitransparent, horny shell of this species, more generally known to collectors by *the second name* which Linnæus gave to it, &c.” I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant,
LOVELL REEVE.

With reference to the foregoing letter, we may remark—

1st. That what Mr. Reeve says respecting the tenth edition of the ‘*Systema Naturæ*’ is totally at variance with the generally received opinion of naturalists that the twelfth is the standard edition of Linnæus’s work, which is to be referred to and followed.

2ndly. That we are fully aware how greatly Mr. Reeve is indebted to the work of M. Moquin-Tandon, and regret that he has so implicitly followed that author in numerous erroneous changes in nomenclature.

3rdly. That Mr. Reeve, however, must not shift the adoption of the name *Planorbis crista* on to his favourite author’s shoulders. Among Mr. Reeve’s own synonymy of the species, we find “*Planorbis (Gyraulis) nautilus*, Moquin-Tandon (1855), *Hist. Moll.* vol. ii. p. 438, which is utterly irreconcilable with the statement in his letter that he follows that author in the adoption of the name *Planorbis crista*.

4thly. That only one construction can be put upon the following passage in his work:—“It may be observed that Linnæus and Draparnaud both made two species of this. The names *crista* and *cristata* have been given to young specimens, and *nautilus* and *imbricatus* to adult specimens.” What can this mean, but that, just as Draparnaud made two species of the shell which he called *cristatus* and *imbricatus*, so Linnæus made two species which he called *crista* and *nautilus*?—a statement at variance with the facts.

On the true Nature of Pleurodyctium problematicum.

By CARL ROMINGER, M.D.

Under the above name I have long kept in my cabinet a specimen collected at Kirchweiler, in the Eifel Mountains. After having identified it with the fossil described by Goldfuss, I laid it aside; and only recently, twenty years afterwards, when I happened to look over it again, the first glance convinced me that the *Pleurodyctium problematicum* is merely the cap of a *Favosites*, or, more accurately speaking, of a *Michelinia*. I have subsequently found that Milne-Edwards had already recognized the family affinity between *Favosites* and *Pleurodyctium*, without, however, suggesting a generic identity of the two.

The fossil from Kirchweiler is represented by a lenticular cavity, a little over one inch in diameter and scarcely half an inch deep. To one side of this cavity are attached the bases of conical sub-